

Exhibit B

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

- - - - - X
MOOG INC.,) 22-CV-187
Plaintiff)
vs.
SKYRYSE, INC., et al) Buffalo, New York
Defendant.) July 15, 2022
- - - - - X
ORAL ARGUMENT
Proceeding held via Zoom for Government Platform
All parties appeared remotely.
Transcribed from audio of Zoom for Government Platform

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE HONORABLE JEREMIAH J. MCCARTHY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

FOR PLAINTIFF: SHEPPHARD MULLIN RICHETER & HAMPTON, LLP
BY: RENA ANDOH, ESQ.
LAI YIP, ESQ.
KAZIM A. NAQVI, ESQ.
-and-
HODGSON RUSS, LLP
BY: ROBERT J. FLUSKEY, JR, ESQ.
PAULINE MUTO, ESQ.

FOR DEFENDANT: LATHAM & WATKINS, LLP
BY: DOUGLAS E. LUMISH, ESQ.
GABRIEL S. GROSS, ESQ.
KELLEY STOREY, ESQ.
ARMAN ZAHOORY, ESQ.
RYAN BANKS, ESQ.

FOR DEFENDANT
PILKINGTON/KIM: WINGET, SPADAFORA & SCHWARTZBERG, LLP
BY: ALEXANDER ASHER TRUITT, ESQ.
ANTHONY D. GREEN, ESQ.

COURT REPORTER: Karen J. Clark, Official Court Reporter
Karenclark1013@AOL.com
100 State Street
Rochester, New York 14614

MOOG, INC. VS. SKYRYSE, INC.

just so that they can get some kind of a response to their interrogatory now that we're then going to have to continue to modify four or five or six times as we continue to get access to these files and we continue to identify these lists. So, I think our original proposal would have been to say, when we renew our motion for preliminary injunction, which we're going to do at the close of fact discovery, that, at that point in time, we include the full identification of trade secrets so that they have plenty of time to oppose that identity of trade secrets in their motion and that they have plenty of opportunity to prepare for the hearing before Judge Vilardo, and so that the entire briefing before Judge Vilardo is consistent with what we're actually claiming for purposes of the preliminary injunction hearing. I think that, again, no one is saying that we're not going to do it. And, your Honor, we also, I almost feel sheepish saying this, but, you know, this is not because of a lack of effort on our part or because of lack of organization or because, you know, we're hiding the ball or intentionally trying to put them at a disadvantage in the discovery process. The whole reason we asked for expedited discovery in the first place is so that we could perform this identification before we got to the

1 MOOG, INC. VS. SKYRYSE, INC.

14:34:17 2 identified what it is that is on the devices that have
14:34:21 3 been produced over to IDS with any specificity.

14:34:24 4 Ultimately, your Honor, I think you, know
14:34:26 5 notwithstanding the fact that I've kind of gone on a
14:34:30 6 little bit of a diatribe here, we're in 100 percent
14:34:34 7 agreement with your Honor to the extent that we are
14:34:36 8 entirely committing to giving an identification of trade
14:34:40 9 secrets if we are just given the access we've been
14:34:45 10 trying to get for four months now to these images at IDS
14:34:49 11 and we get a reasonable amount of time to review them so
14:34:55 12 that we can compile a list that is actually going to be
14:34:58 13 meaningful. And I'll also say, in response to their
14:35:02 14 suggestion that we continue to update or we continue to
14:35:11 15 supplement, if we have to continue to supplement with
14:35:15 16 given the volume that is involved here, we're talking
14:35:18 17 about potentially hundreds of thousands of individual
14:35:21 18 identifications. If we have to continue to do this over
14:35:24 19 and over again, it's going to become a full-time job for
14:35:27 20 us to just supplement. It makes infinite sense what
14:35:33 21 your Honor is proposing that if they are to have an
14:35:36 22 identification of trade secrets prior to depositions
14:35:41 23 commencing, that we do this once we turn it over to them
14:35:44 24 and then depositions commence.

14:35:46 25 MAGISTRATE JUDGE MCCARTHY: Now, let me ask,